



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/690,934	10/22/2003	Josef Stohr	941-011558-US (PAR)	6938
2512	7590	09/15/2005	EXAMINER MANOHARAN, MUTHUSWAMY GANAPATHY	
PERMAN & GREEN 425 POST ROAD FAIRFIELD, CT 06824			ART UNIT 2683	PAPER NUMBER

DATE MAILED: 09/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/690,934	STOHR ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Muthuswamy G. Manoharan	2683	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 October 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-40 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/22/03</u> | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claim 27 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Andre et al. (hereinafter Andre) (WO 98/01876).

Regarding claim 27, Andre teaches a mobile communication terminal (Figure 1-3) having a user interface comprising: a display for showing information (item 12 in Figure 1), a keypad including a plurality of hard keys (item 23 in Figure 2), the labels of the hard keys including textual and/or graphical content relating to the function of the hard key (Figure 2 and 3) concerned, at least one of the hard keys being formed by an at least partially transparent key body that allows objects under the key to be seen through the top of the key (Page 1, lines 6-7), a label arranged under the polarized films that can be another, key under a pair of moved relative to one whereby the textual and/or graphical content of the label can be read in at least two different orientations in dependence of relative orientation of the polarized films to one another (Page 3, lines 21-31).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

Art Unit: 2683

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

Claim 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bar-Yona (US 6,805,506).

Regarding claim 26, Bar-Yona teaches a mobile communication terminal (Figure 14) having a user interface comprising: a display for showing information (Figure 14), a keypad (Col. 4, line 15) including a plurality of hard keys, the labels of the hard keys (Figure 14), keys including textual and or graphical content (Figure 2) relating to the function of the hard key concerned, at least one of the hard keys comprises a lenticular screen (Col. 3, line 28) with at least two interlaced labels there behind, each of the at least two labels being visible from a different view point and preferably being readable in a different orientation (Col. 3, lines 3-6; Figure 3C).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ali et al. (hereinafter Ali) (US 2003/0197679) in view of Smith (US 2002/0033836).

Regarding claim 1, Ali teaches a user interface (Figure 5) comprising: a display for showing information, a keypad including at least one soft key (Paragraph [0068], line

Art Unit: 2683

1; item 820 in Figure 8B), the function of the soft-key being controlled by a controller unit and being displayed as a soft label in a predetermined area of said display, and means for instructing the controller unit to change the orientation of the soft label (item 820 in Figure 8B and Figure 8C). Ali fails to teach a mobile communication terminal. However, Smith teaches a mobile communication terminal (Paragraph [0006], lines 2-3). Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to make the user interface a mobile communication terminal. This modification improves the mobility of the user since it eliminates the need for long wires.

Regarding claim 2, Ali further teaches the controller unit changes the orientation of the soft label without changing the position of the predetermined area relative to the at least one soft-key (Paragraph [0070], lines 8-11).

Regarding claim 3, Ali further teaches, wherein the controller unit changes the orientation of the soft label in response to a state change of the terminal or upon a user entered command (Paragraph [0089], lines 4-10; Figure 8B and Figure 8C).

Regarding claim 4, Ali and Smith further teaches a terminal according to claim 1, wherein the controller unit changes the orientation of the soft label in response to a signal from an orientation sensor in the terminal or in response to a manually activated switch (Ali; Paragraph [0089], lines 4-10; Figure 8B and Figure 8C) (see also Smith, Paragraph [0018]).

Regarding claim 5, Ali further teaches a terminal according to claim 1, wherein the controller unit applies the same orientation changes to information on the display as to the soft label (Figure 8B and Figure 8C).

Regarding claim 6, Ali further teaches a terminal according to claim 1, wherein the soft label includes textual content (Figure 8B and Figure 8C).

Regarding claim 7, Ali and Smith further teaches a terminal according to claim 1, wherein the soft label includes graphical content (See Ali, Figure 8B and Figure 8C) (Also see Smith (Paragraph [0015], lines 15-16).

Regarding claim 13, Ali in view of Smith teaches all the particulars of the claim 1. Ali further teaches a terminal according to claim 1, wherein the keypad comprises a plurality of soft-keys, the function of each of the soft-keys being displayed by the controller unit a predetermined area in the display, the controller unit changing the orientation of the soft labels in response to user or sensor input (Figure 8B and Figure 8C, Paragraph [0066], lines 6-9).

Claims 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 2002/0033836) in view of Morgenthaler (US 6,310,609).

Regarding claim 8, Smith teaches all the particulars of claim 1 (Figures 1-4; paragraph [0015], lines 11-17). Smith further teaches a terminal according to claim 1, wherein the keypad comprises a plurality of hard keys. Smith does not teach expressly the plurality of hard keys preferably includes a group of alphanumerical keys and/or one or more navigation keys. However, Morgenthaler teaches in an analogous art, a terminal, wherein the keypad comprises a plurality of hard keys, the plurality of hard keys preferably includes a group of alphanumerical keys and/or one or more navigation keys (Figure 1). Therefore, it would be obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include wherein the keypad comprises a plurality of hard keys, the

plurality of hard keys preferably includes a group of alphanumeric keys and/or one or more navigation keys. This would provide additional flexibility in activating desired operation to be performed with in the device.

Regarding claim 9, Smith teaches all the particulars of claim 1 (Figures 1-4; paragraph [0015], lines 11-17). However, Smith fails to teach a terminal according to claim 1, wherein at least one of the hard keys is provided with a hard label that can be read in at least two different orientations. However, Morgenthaler teaches in an analogous art, a terminal, wherein at least one of the hard keys is provided with a hard label that can be read in at least two different orientations (Figure 1). Therefore, it would be obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to include wherein wherein at least one of the hard keys is provided with a hard label that can be read in at least two different orientations. This would make the interface very user friendly.

Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 2002/0033836) in view of Morgenthaler (US 6,310,609) and further in view of Miano (US 2004/0045204).

Regarding claim 10, Smith in view of Morganthaler teaches all the particulars of the claim 9. Moreover, neither Smith nor Morganthaler teach, wherein the hard label is formed by a hologram. However, Miano teaches in an analogous art, wherein the hard label is formed by a hologram. Therefore, it would be obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a terminal, wherein the hard label is formed by a hologram. This label modification generates a 3D image to communicate an appearance feature, a functional feature, and/or a method of use of the product.

Claims 11 and 12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 2002/0033836) in view of Morgenthaler (US 6,310,609) and further in view of Andre (WO 98/01876)

Regarding claim 11, Smith in view of Morgenthaler teaches all the particulars of claim 9. Moreover, neither Smith nor Morgenthaler specifically teach a mobile communication terminal having a user interface, wherein the hard label is changed by changing the backlighting of the hard key concerned. However, Andre teaches in an analogous art, a mobile communication terminal having a user interface, wherein the hard label is changed by changing the backlighting of the hard key concerned (Page 1, lines 6-7; Page 3, lines 21-31). Therefore, it would be obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a mobile communication terminal having a user interface, wherein the hard label is changed by changing the backlighting of the hard key concerned. This modification makes the key a multifunctional one.

Regarding claim 12, Smith in view of Morgenthaler teaches all the particulars of claim 9. Moreover, neither Smith nor Morgenthaler specifically teach a mobile communication terminal having a user interface, wherein the orientation of hard label is changed by rotating a polarized film relative to another polarized film. However, Andre teaches in an analogous art, a mobile communication terminal having a user interface, wherein the orientation of hard label is changed by rotating a polarized film relative to another polarized film (Page 1, lines 6-7; Page 3, lines 21-31). Therefore, it would be obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a mobile

communication terminal having a user interface, wherein the orientation of hard label is changed by rotating a polarized film relative to another polarized film. This modification makes the key a multifunctional one.

Claims 14-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Smith (US 2002/0033836) in view of Logan et al. (hereinafter Logan) (US 6,816,577).

Regarding claim 14, Smith teaches a mobile communication terminal having a user interface comprising: a display for showing information, the present function of the at least one hard key being controlled by a controller unit in dependence of the orientation of the terminal, and means for informing the controller unit of the orientation of the terminal (Paragraph [0018]). Smith fails to teach a keypad including at least one hard key with a hard label that can be read in at least two different orientations.

However, Logan teaches in an analogous art, a keypad including at least one hard key with a hard label that can be read in at least two different orientations (figure 2).

Therefore, it would be obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time invention to a keypad including at least one hard key with a hard label that can be read in at least two different orientations. This modification would make the keypad very user friendly.

Regarding claim 15, Smith in view of Logan teaches all the particulars of Claim 14. Smith further teaches a terminal according to claim 14, wherein the orientation of the information on the display is changed in accordance with the orientation of the terminal (Paragraph [0020], line 3-5; Figures 1-4).

Regarding claim 16, Smith in view of Logan teaches all the particulars of claim 14. Smith fails to teach wherein the hard label includes textual content. However, Logan teaches in an analogous art, wherein the hard label includes textual content (Figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the hard label includes textual content. This modification makes the keys more users friendly.

Regarding claim 17, Smith in view of Logan teaches all the particulars of claim 14. Smith fails to teach wherein the hard label includes graphical content. However, Logan teaches in an analogous art, wherein the hard label includes graphical content (Figure 2). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the hard label includes graphical content. This modification makes the keys more users friendly.

Claims 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuovo et al. (hereinafter Nuovo) (US 6,676,969) in view of Miano et al. (hereinafter Miano) (US 2004/0045204).

Regarding claim 18, Nuovo discloses a mobile communication terminal having a user interface comprising: a display, a keypad including keys, for showing information, at with a plurality of hard the labels of the hard keys including textual and or graphical content relating to the function of the hard key concerned (Figure 2). Nuovo does not disclose expressly, the label of least one of the hard keys being formed by a hologram on which the textual and/or graphical content can be read in at least two different orientations. However, Miano teaches in an analogous art (labeling method), the label of

least one of the hard keys being formed by a hologram on which the textual and/or graphical content can be read in at least two different orientations (Paragraph [0029], lines 4-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the hard keys being formed by a hologram on which the textual and/or graphical content can be read in at least two different orientations. This label modification generates a 3D image to communicate an appearance feature, a functional feature, and/or a method of use of the product.

Nuovo further teaches a mobile communication terminal according to claim 18, wherein the information on the display can be shown in different orientations (Col. 5, lines 3-11; Figure 4 and Figure 5).

Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Morgenthaler (US 6,310,609) in view of Levy et al. (hereinafter Levi) (US 2004/0217939).

Regarding claim 20, Morgenthaler teaches a mobile communication interface (figure 1) comprising: terminal having a user a display (item 202, Figure 1) for showing information, a keypad including the labels of the hard keys including textual and or graphical content relating to the function of the hard key concerned, a plurality of hard keys (Figure 1), at least one of the hard keys being formed by an at least partially transparent key body (Abstract line 11-12) that allows objects under the key to be seen through the top of the key, the at least two labels being preferably provided with textual and/or graphical content (Figure 1) that can be read in different ordinations, whereby the substrate can be moved relative to the hard key to allow a different one of the at least

Art Unit: 2683

two labels to be visible through the key. Mergenthaler fails to teach labels being arranged under the key on a substrate that can move relative to the key. However, Levi teaches in an analogous art, labels being arranged under the key on a substrate (Paragraph [0019], lines 1-2) that can move relative to the key. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have labels being arranged under the key on a substrate that can move relative to the key. This modification provides a method of changing the visual appearance of a group of keys of a keypad.

Regarding claim 21, Morganthaler in view of Levy teaches all the particulars of claim 20. Morganthaler fails to teach wherein the substrate forms part of a slidable or rotatable substrate that covers a plurality of keys so that a group of labels belonging to a plurality of keys can be moved simultaneously relative to the keys concerned. However, Levy teaches in an analogous art, wherein the substrate forms part of a slidable or rotatable substrate that covers a plurality of keys so that a group of labels belonging to a plurality of keys can be moved simultaneously relative to the keys concerned (Paragraph [0004], lines 1-12). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the substrate forms part of a slidable or rotatable substrate that covers a plurality of keys so that a group of labels belonging to a plurality of keys can be moved simultaneously relative to the keys concerned. This modification provides a method of changing the visual appearance of a group of keys of a keypad.

Regarding claim 22, Morganthaler in view of Levy teaches all the particulars of claim 21. Morganthaler fails to teach wherein a coherent group of functions for a set of keys visible in one position of the substrate, and another group of functions visible in another position of the substrate. However, Levy teaches in an analogous art, teach wherein a coherent group of functions for a set of keys visible in one position of the substrate, and another group of functions visible in another position of the substrate (Paragraph [0009], lines 1-7; Paragraph [0023], lines 17). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a coherent group of functions for a set of keys visible in one position of the substrate, and another group of functions visible in another position of the substrate. This modification provides a method of changing the visual appearance of a group of keys of a keypad.

Regarding claims 23 and 24, Morganthaler in view of Levy teaches all the particulars of claim 20. Levy teaches in an analogous art, wherein substrate can move linearly/rotably relative to key or keys concerned. However, Levy teaches in an analogous art, wherein substrate can move linearly/rotably relative to key or keys concerned (Paragraph [0005], lines 1-4). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to wherein substrate can move linearly/rotably relative to key or keys concerned. This modification provides a method of changing the visual appearance of a group of keys of a keypad.

Regarding claim 25, Morganthaler in view of Levy teaches all the particulars of claim 21. Morganthaler fails to teach, wherein the substrate is user exchangeable and provided with means allowing the mobile terminal to identify the substrate. However,

Levy teaches in an analogous art, wherein the substrate is user exchangeable and provided with means allowing the mobile terminal to identify the substrate (Paragraph [0027], lines 3-10). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to wherein substrate can move linearly/rotably relative to key or keys concerned. This modification provides a method of changing the visual appearance of a group of keys of a keypad.

Claim 28 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nuovo et al. (hereinafter Nuovo) (US 6,676,969) in view of Ostergard et al. (hereinafter Ostergard) (US 6,926,418).

Regarding claim 28, Nuovo teaches a mobile communication terminal having a user interface comprising: a display for showing information (item 54 in Figure 2), a keypad including a plurality of hard keys arranged in a substantially circular pattern (item 56 in Figure 2), the labels of the hard keys including textual and or graphical content (items 64,66 in Figure 2) relating to the function of the hard key concerned (Figure 2), the hard keys being formed by an at least partially transparent key body that allows objects under the key to be seen through the top of the key, the labels of the hard keys being arranged in a substantial circular pattern that matches the circular pattern in which the hard keys are arranged. Nuovo fails to teach the hard keys being formed by an at least partially transparent key body that allows objects under the key to be seen through the top of the key, the labels of the hard keys being arranged on a substrate. However, Ostergard teaches in an analogous art, the hard keys being formed by an at least partially transparent key body that allows objects under the key to be

seen through the top of the key (Col. 2, lines 64-67), the labels of the hard keys being arranged on a substrate (Col. 5, lines 1-6). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the hard keys being formed by an at least partially transparent key body that allows objects under the key to be seen through the top of the key, the labels of the hard keys being arranged on a substrate. This modification provides a keyboard illumination system where the light guide and user-interface are integrated.

Claim 29 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (hereinafter Logan) (US 6,816,577) in view of Ali et al. (hereinafter Ali) (US 2003/0197679).

Regarding claim 29, Logan teaches a mobile communication terminal having a user interface comprising: a display (Figure 2), a confirming key and a rejection key, a function to be confirmed or to be rejected being controlled by a controller unit and being displayed in a predetermined area of said display (Col. 4, lines 1-10). Logan fails to teach means for instructing the controller unit to change the orientation in which the function is displayed. However, Ali teaches in an analogous art (user interface), the means for instructing the controller unit to change the orientation in which the function is displayed (item 820 in Figure 8B and Figure 8C). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to provide the means for instructing the controller unit to change the orientation in which the function is displayed. This modification provides the user with a flexibility to adjust the viewing area of the display unit.

Regarding claim 30, Logan in view of Ali teaches all the particulars of the claim 29. Logan fails to teach a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the controller unit changes the orientation of the function to be confirmed or to be rejected without changing the position of the predetermined area relative to the confirming key and rejection key. However, Ali teaches in an analogous art (user interface), a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the controller unit changes the orientation of the function to be confirmed or to be rejected without changing the position of the predetermined area relative to the confirming key and rejection key (item 820 in Figure 8B and Figure 8C). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the controller unit changes the orientation of the function to be confirmed or to be rejected without changing the position of the predetermined area relative to the confirming key and rejection key. This modification provides the user with a flexibility to adjust the viewing area of the display unit.

Regarding claim 31, Logan in view of Ali teaches all the particulars of the claim 29. Logan fails to teach a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the controller unit changes the orientation of the function to be confirmed or to be rejected in response to a state change of the terminal or upon a user entered command. However, Ali teaches in an analogous art, wherein the controller unit changes the orientation of the function to be confirmed or to be rejected in response to a state change of the terminal or upon a user entered command (Paragraph [0066], lines 4-11; Figure 8B and Figure 8C). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention

to have the controller unit changes the orientation of the function to be confirmed or to be rejected in response to a state change of the terminal or upon a user entered command. This modification provides the user with a flexibility to adjust the viewing area of the display unit.

Regarding claim 32, Logan in view of Ali teaches all the particulars of the claim 29. Logan fails to teach a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the controller unit changes the orientation of the function to be confirmed or to be rejected in response to a signal from an orientation sensor in the terminal or in response to a manually activated switch. However, Ali teaches in an analogous art, wherein the controller unit changes the orientation of the function to be confirmed or to be rejected in response to a signal from an orientation sensor in the terminal or in response to a manually activated switch (Paragraph [0066], lines 4-11; Paragraph [0070], lines 8-11; Figure 8B and Figure 8C). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the controller unit changes the orientation of the function to be confirmed or to be rejected in response to a signal from an orientation sensor in the terminal or in response to a manually activated switch. This modification provides the user with a flexibility to adjust the viewing area of the display unit.

Regarding claim 33, Logan in view of Ali teaches all the particulars of the claim 29. Logan fails to teach a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the controller unit applies the same orientation changes to information on the display as to the function to be confirmed or to be rejected. However, Ali teaches in an analogous art, wherein the controller unit applies the same orientation changes to information on the display as to

the function to be confirmed or to be rejected (Figure 8B and Figure 8C). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the controller unit apply the same orientation changes to information on the display as to the function to be confirmed or to be rejected. This modification provides the user with a flexibility to adjust the viewing area of the display unit.

Regarding claim 34, Logan in view of Ali teaches all the particulars of the claim 29. Ali further teaches a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the function to be confirmed or to be rejected is represented by textual content (Figure 2).

Regarding claim 35, Logan in view of Ali teaches all the particulars of the claim 29. Logan fails to teach a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the function to be confirmed or to be rejected is represented by graphical content. However, Ali teaches in an analogous art, a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the function to be confirmed or to be rejected is represented by graphical content (item 820 in Figure 8B and Figure 8C; Paragraph [0068], line 7). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the function to be confirmed or to be rejected is represented by graphical content. This modification makes the interface efficient and convenient.

Regarding claim 36, Logan in view of Ali teaches all the particulars of the claim 29. Logan further teaches a terminal according to claim 29, wherein the keypad comprises a plurality of hard keys, the plurality of hard keys preferably includes a group of alphanumeric keys and/or one or more navigation keys (Figure 2).

Regarding claim 37, Logan teaches a terminal according to claim 29, wherein at least one of the hard keys is provided with a hard label (Figure 2) that can be read in at least two different orientations.

Claim 38 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan in view of Ali and further in view of Miano. Regarding claim 38, Logan in view of Ali teaches all the particulars of the claim 38 except wherein the hard label is formed by a hologram. However, Miano teaches in an analogous art (labeling method), the hard label is formed by a hologram (Paragraph [0029], lines 4-11). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the hard label formed by a hologram. This label modification generates a 3D image to communicate an appearance feature, a functional feature, and/or a method of use of the product.

Regarding claim 39, Logan in view of Miano teaches all the particulars of claim 38. Logan fails to teach a terminal, wherein the hard label is changed by changing the back lighting of the hard key concerned. However, Miano teaches in an analogous art, the hard label is changed by changing the backlighting of the hard key concerned (Paragraph [0042], lines 13-18). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to have the hard label changed by changing the backlighting of the hard key concerned. This modification improves the viewing experience.

Claim 40 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Logan et al. (hereinafter Logan) (US 6,816,577) in view of Ali et al. (hereinafter Ali) (US 2003/0197679) and further in view of Andre et al. (hereinafter Andre) (WO 98/01876).

Regarding claim 40, Logan in view of Ali teaches all the particulars of the claim 29. Moreover, neither Logan nor Ali specifically teach a terminal according to claim 39, wherein the orientation of hard label is changed by rotating a polarized film relative to another polarized film. Therefore, it have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to modify the terminal wherein the orientation of hard label is changed by rotating a polarized film relative to another polarized film (Page 3, lines 21-31). This modification makes the key a multifunctional one.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Muthuswamy G. Manoharan whose telephone number is 571-272-5515. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30AM-4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, William Trost can be reached on 571-272-7872. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



WILLIAM TROST
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600